

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, might I inquire of the Chair: It is my understanding now that the Republicans will have 30 minutes; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. INHOFE. All right, Mr. President, I am going to go ahead and take the first 15 minutes. Then, it is my understanding that the Senator from Georgia, Mr. CHAMBLISS, wants 5 minutes, and Senator CRAIG wants 10 minutes after that. I would like to lock that in with a UC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to draw the Senate's attention to an editorial in today's Wall Street Journal and particularly the first sentence. It says:

Nancy Pelosi, Harry Reid, and other liberal leaders on Capitol Hill are gripped by cold-sweat terror. If they permit a vote on offshore drilling, they know they will lose. . . .

The editorial goes on to point out what the Democrats' plan of action is for this problem: to cut off debate. We have been in session this week. We have held one vote. We are considering a bill relating to energy, but the Democrats are not allowing us to offer any amendments to find new sources of energy, when the editorial points out that at least 65 percent of America's recoverable oil and 40 percent of America's natural gas is under moratorium.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks the editorial be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. INHOFE. What they are talking about are those areas where we have huge supplies that we can access, except we cannot do it because there are moratoria, such as exists right now in terms of the Rocky Mountain oil shale, with 2 trillion barrels; the Outer Continental Shelf, for which 85 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is under an order that the Democrats have on there, so we are not able to explore, to produce, to drill in those areas. You hear the argument quite often that there are 68 million acres that could be explored right now and they are not doing it. They are not doing it for one reason, and that is because there is no oil there.

Throughout this week I have heard a number of my Democratic colleagues come to the floor and express their sup-

port for increased drilling. Apparently, this has all been some kind of misunderstanding. I have taken their consistent votes against increasing domestic production as being against new drilling. If we all agreed that new domestic production is part of what we need to do, then let's get on with some votes and get them underway.

My Web site is epw.senate.gov. EPW stands for Environment and Public Works. What I have done is gone back and gotten all of the votes we have had that would cause us—allow us to expand our supply in America in areas such as this. Right now on party lines they have been killed—killed by the Democratic Party. This is a problem. Somehow, the Democrats are trying to convince the American people that supply and demand is not alive and well in America. It is interesting that the other day in the newspaper, it was either an op-ed piece or it might have been on the editorial page of the Washington Post, they said even Congress is not going to be able to repeal the law of supply and demand.

The American people understand the need for new domestic production. Recent polling has shown 67 percent of the American people now support offshore drilling with only 18 percent opposed. Sixty-four percent believe that if offshore drilling is allowed, gas prices will go down. Well, that is a natural conclusion you can come to.

Another poll found that 81 percent of Americans support greater use of domestic energy sources. Both papers in my home State of Oklahoma have weighed in on this issue with recent editorials. The Tulsa World and the Oklahoman have weighed in, pointing to how new production can be done in an environmental manner. The Tulsa World wrote:

President George W. Bush made the correct decision when he lifted the White House's 18-year ban on offshore drilling . . . No one wants the environment damaged. This work could be done safely. It could be done over the long term only if Congress had the good sense to act.

The Oklahoman wrote—this is in Oklahoma City:

Democrats reacted to President Bush's lifting of an executive ban on offshore drilling by vowing to keep in place congressional prohibitions dating to the 1980s. The debate over energy policy just keeps getting better and better. For years the Democratic Party has blocked efforts to significantly increase production of America's sources of offshore oil and natural gas, citing potential dangers to beaches in California and Florida and dismissing any new oil finds as too far in the future to help U.S. energy needs. Both arguments have less persuasive steam with the current oil prices. Certainly, if drilling offshore had gotten underway a decade ago or more—instead of being stymied—Americans know it would be online now and helping to absorb some of the current price increase.

This is the interesting thing about it. We know what is happening in Prudhoe Bay. We know what the reserves are in ANWR. We know we have a pipeline. If we had a pipeline filled and if the President—at that time Bill Clinton—

had not vetoed the bill that would have allowed us to go into ANWR.

New domestic production should happen and can be done in an environmentally appropriate way. No country on Earth has exploration technology as advanced and environmentally sound as ours. I have to say also that we are the only country—I can't think of another country, and I hope if someone has the name of a country that would be an exception—there is not another country in the world that doesn't exploit their own resources. Certainly, these resources alone are enough to make us totally independent of any foreign importation of oil and the prices would come down.

I have highlighted some of the amounts of domestic reserves previously, but I think it is important to continue to point to the amount of reserves in the United States. There they are, right there, and we have actually enumerated them for the purposes of the RECORD.

The potential energy development from the Rocky Mountain oil shale is truly massive with reports estimating up to 2 trillion barrels, but once again, Democrats are blocking development. The Consolidated Appropriations Act last year established a 1-year moratorium on the necessary funding to complete the final regulations for commercial leasing of oil shale.

Look at the size of this. We are talking about not 10 billion barrels we would find in ANWR, not 14 billion barrels as we see on the Outer Continental Shelf, but 2 trillion barrels. Without congressional action, a 1-year delay could end up lasting much longer and, like the Outer Continental Shelf appropriations moratorium, continue year after year.

The RAND Corporation estimates that as many as 1.1 trillion barrels are recoverable and at prices as low as \$35 to \$48 a barrel within the first 12 years of commercial scale production. At current rates of consumption, 1.1 trillion barrels equals more than 145 years of domestic supply. This number would nearly double assuming the Department of Energy's estimate of nearly 2 trillion potentially recoverable barrels. Finally, development is ongoing in the Canadian oil sands where proven reserves are about 179 billion barrels. We need to continue to do that. Right now, they are in jeopardy. Congressman WAXMAN has put on a prohibition in the Department of Defense using oil from those oil sands. If anyone were tempted to try to expand that so that no one else in the country could use it, that would be devastating. So that effort could be underway as we speak.

In an effort to hide their true record of blocking access to America's own resources, the Democrats are engaged in a campaign of shifting blame, claiming there are 68 million acres in America where oil and gas companies have the right to drill but are not drilling. Some 44 percent of the leases that have been